

REMARKS

Claims 1, 20, and 29-35 were rejected as being anticipated or obvious in view of JP 10292084 to Kuzuhara et al. or JP 11322812 to Furuta et al. In view of the present amendments, in which claim 1 was amended and claims 20 and 29-35 were canceled, the rejection is moot.

Claims 1-35 were provisionally rejected under the obviousness-type double patenting doctrine in view of USSN 09/579,843, which was published as US 6,610,793. Applicants respectfully disagree that the claims in US 6,610,793 render obvious the present claims at least because the claims in US 6,610,793 do not contemplate exposing to moisture the claimed article wherein the article is selected from a film, fiber or foam. Without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection but merely to expedite the allowance of claims 1-19 and 21-28, Applicants are submitting a Terminal Disclaimer, which renders the rejection moot.

Applicants believe the present claims are allowable and respectfully request allowance of the application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4276 to resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,



G. Peter Nichols
Registration No. 34,401
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200